DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 765 SP 012 566

AUTHOR Francis, J. Bruce; Neff, Charles B.
TITLE The Recognition and Reward of Teaching Excellence. An Evaluation.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Buffalo.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 138p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Effective Teaching; *Higher Education; *Program Evaluation; *Rewards; *State Universities
IDENTIFIERS *State University of New York

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of a two-year evaluative study of three State University of New York (SUNY) programs for the recognition and reward of good teaching. The purposes of the study, part of a nationwide investigation of the value of such programs, were to understand how different programs contribute to recognition of good teaching and to make the University's current programs more responsive to the needs of faculty. During Year One, a three-phase study was undertaken. Phase I surveyed a random sample of SUNY faculty to ascertain their awareness of and general reactions to the three reward programs (Excellence in Teaching Awards, Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction, and Distinguished Teaching Professorships). Phase II surveyed those faculty who had applied for a grant or been nominated for an award (whether successful or not) to ascertain their perceptions of the selection process and program impact. Phase III produced case studies of programs at a number of SUNY campuses on how the programs were implemented at the campus level. Year Two concerns were on (1) dissemination of the results of the Year One evaluation, (2) program improvement based upon those evaluations, and (3) experimentation with a process designed to build widespread support for enhancing the importance of teaching at SUNY. Combined results of the Year One study and the evaluation of Year Two generated the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report. (MJB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED152765

The Recognition and Reward of Teaching Excellence

an evaluation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CERIC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
FUND ASSOCIATE
OF
NATIONAL PROJECT III

"Enhancing the Importance of Teaching"
Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education

March 1978

SP012566

THE RECOGNITION AND REWARD OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE

AN EVALUATION

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

FUND ASSOCIATE
OF
NATIONAL PROJECT III

"Enhancing the Importance of Teaching"

Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education

FINAL REPORT

by

J. Bruce Francis, Evaluation Director

Department of Higher Education

State University of New York at Buffalo

Charles B. Neff, Project Director

Provost for Academic Programs

State University of New York

January 1978

PROJECT STAFF

YEAR ONE

Martin F. Finkelstein	Research Associate
Lisa T. Stratton	Research Assistant
Eleanor Bealer	Project Secretary (Buffalo)
Ann Nevitt	Project Secretary (Albany)

YEAR TWO

Griffith Jones	Research Associate
Joan Segal	Research Assistant
Marie Rosso	Project Secretary (Buffalo)
	Project Secretary (Albany)

Table of Contents

	Page
Summary and Recommendations	i
The Recognition and Reward of Teaching Excellence - Introduction	1
Procedures - Year I	3
Procedures - Year II	10
Results - Year I	11
Results - Year II	25
Evaluation Summary - Year II	27
Appendices:	
Appendix A - Phase I and II Questionnaires	
Appendix B - Table of Results	
Appendix C - Statistically Significant Group Differences	
Appendix D - Questionnaire to Potential Year II Program Participants	
Appendix E - Post-Meeting Feedback from Participants	

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following comments and recommendations are drawn from, but not limited to, the survey and interview results reported in the body of the report which follows.

The report itself is primarily based upon a carefully constructed survey of opinions and experience about teaching improvement programs in State University of New York. As part of the evaluation, two mailed surveys were conducted--one to a general faculty sample and another to a selected sample of recipients, awardees, and others closely involved with the two programs under review--and on-site interviews were conducted. Additionally, the opinions of awardees were solicited in 11 regional meetings held throughout the second year of the project.

The main report, discusses what is statistically significant in the expressed opinions. That kind of significance is important but it is not the only type of significant finding. Measures of statistical significance help us to eliminate statements made by chance; yet a rank ordering of statistically significant findings cannot be translated directly into a program evaluation.

Much of what we learned in the evaluation of the existing configuration of awards and rewards for teaching might help us to improve that configuration. However, that may also not be the best available configuration. It was designed in a different time and with different purposes in mind than those which presently might seem most important. Our recommendations deal not only with what has been done but also with what might be done, given present circumstances, faculty needs, and availability of resources.

PROPOSITIONS

Our comments and recommendations are based upon two general propositions.

1. There is a continuing need to acknowledge excellence in teaching and

to provide means outside of regular support channels for the improvement of instruction. Both our survey and our discussions reveal an overwhelming desire on the part of the faculty for programs with these dual effects. Only a small number of faculty are presently tied in to the present reward and award structure and it is an important goal to expand the pool of those who take pride in the excellence of their teaching and of the learning of their students.

2. No system of awards and rewards should remain static. Circumstances change, faculty needs and attitudes change. Some flexibility in responding to changing needs and circumstances serves better to enhance the importance of teaching than does the maintenance of outmoded programs and procedures, however well-intended.

PERCEPTIONS

Our most significant impressions are the following:

1. Teaching awards may be important in some respects but they do little to improve teaching. They do heighten personal satisfaction and symbolize institutional commitment to teaching.

2. Teaching awards also provide one additional good over which faculty can squabble, sometimes to the detriment of the teaching improvement they are designed to support. If equalization of status between the task of teaching and the task of research is desired, the rewards have some value. But equalization of status as a social good is sometimes narrowly defined in an academic community. The act of defining it can have negative effects and, even in the best of circumstances, is not always directly related to the instructional process.

3. Teaching awards definitely tend to favor the professor in the more visible field, the one with larger classes and the one with the high amount

of public charisma. They are weighted against people who may be doing a superb job in academic areas which are low in the academic pecking order, whose field attracts few students or who have to teach in high contact-hour, non-lecture formats.

4. If one wants to improve teaching, paradoxically one should be very careful about interfering with what is already going on. There is a kind of temptation in an academic organization to think that improvement requires intervention.

5. Most of the persons singled out for teaching awards were happy to receive them and the attention they represented. At the same time, they were, in many cases, a bit nonplussed to be chosen. They were, most said, doing what they would have been doing anyway. Teaching was, for them, already an intrinsic reward of real importance. For the recipients, being chosen had two consequences, neither of which was always beneficial to their activities as committed teachers. As a first consequence, their academic world suddenly expected them to be able to articulate what it was that they did that made them outstanding. Some teachers were better prepared than others to deal with that question. Many were vaguely troubled that the award curried with it an obligation to answer it in a public way. As a second consequence, most awardees found that their time was invaded and that the precious hours they would gladly dedicate to being with students or improving their classroom activities were being eaten up by committee work and other service activities derived from their reward. In many cases awardees found that the amount of time devoted to these new non-teaching activities detracted from the very thing for which they had been rewarded.

6. In a university system or consortium, the centralization of teaching awards has advantages and disadvantages. The addition of a procedural step once removed from purely campus considerations appears to encourage campuses to

elevate their criteria for selection above the least common denominator of local concerns. But centralization has its limits as well. It may, on occasion, make it seem as if it is an extra-campus authority rather than the campus itself which most values good teaching.

7. Merely because the awards were given centrally did not produce the presumed cross-campus interaction which was built into the design of both teaching awards in SUNY. If a central administration wishes to capitalize upon the potential cross-campus reinforcement of teaching awards, some additional investment in that process beyond the awards themselves must be made.

8. Specifically with regard to grants for the improvement of instruction: it is important that procedures be proportionate to the resources available. In general, if a small amount of resources is available, complete decentralization of funding to the campuses and simplification of procedures seems most prudent. If larger amounts of resources are available so that progams with major impact upon instruction or with cross-campus consequences can reasonably be supported, the institution of all-university procedures, for all their cumbersomeness, may be justified.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We now offer the following recommendations to State University of New York.

1. SUNY should invest more in the improvement of instruction. SUNY, in comparison with many other university systems devotes far too little of its resources to the improvement of instruction. This statement holds true regardless whether one considers only the programs administered centrally or adds to them campus resources for the same purposes.

2. Perhaps central teaching awards should be continued; perhaps not. Much depends on whether the University wishes to continue a symbolic recognition of teaching or use rather limited funds more directly for the improvement of teaching.

The purposes of teaching awards should be thoroughly reviewed by the Chancellor and his staff in conjunction with the Faculty Senate.

3. Teaching awards should be compared in their effectiveness to other types of teaching improvement programs. The continuance of the present proportion of teaching awards to other types of activities which might improve faculty or professional performance should not be taken as a given. The pooling of all resources into a single faculty professional development fund which might, among other things, support teaching awards but not necessarily to the degree they are presently supported, is recommended. Such a pooling does not imply a single-purpose program. Indeed, diversity of program should actively be fostered. But some combination of resources could allow for an easier shifting of resources, as changing circumstances dictate, than would the maintenance of separately administered programs.

4. While the University should encourage appropriately different campus activities to improve teaching, two steps should be taken by all campuses. First, any committee charged with the improvement of teaching, selecting of teaching awardees, or the granting of instructional improvement funds should be made a standing committee of the college. The conversion of an ad hoc or special purpose committee into a standing committee will, we think, have the effect of regularizing procedures for selecting awardees and grants and will, as the committee collects experience, lead to ways of identifying important contributors to teaching on campus who are not characterized by large popular classes and the lecture method. Second, an administrative person should be given specific responsibility for enhancing and promoting teaching improvement activities. The designated administrative person should serve as the prime mover, facilitator, and source of information about programs, within SUNY and outside, for the improvement of teaching.

5. Until a larger amount of funding is available for instructional improvement grants, we would strongly recommend that the procedures for the granting of faculty grants for the improvement of undergraduate instruction be greatly simplified. If the program continues to operate at the present level, it would be advisable to decentralize funds to campuses, probably on a matching basis, and leave selection of projects up to campus committees exclusively. Such committees could operate under guidelines developed on a University-wide basis and similar to those presently used to administer the faculty grants for improvement of undergraduate instruction.

6. The University should improve information dissemination on faculty grants, teaching awards, and any other programs for teaching improvement. We would suggest that information should be displayed in a box which appears regularly and in the same position in each issue of The News. At the beginning of the year, all information--application procedures, deadlines--for the entire year should be summarized. Thereafter the box should display information on current teaching improvement activities of interest to the faculty.

7. The University should invest more heavily in the inter-campus dialogue on excellence in teaching. Although they were not specifically evaluated in this project, we were impressed by the effectiveness of the Faculty Exchange and Conversations in the Disciplines programs. The latter may be defined too narrowly and could be expanded to include inter-campus programming and pedagogical interests, as well as those of the disciplines, per se. But the basic format has worked well in both cases.

FINAL COMMENT

The State University of New York can more effectively use its special advantages as a system to improve teaching. To do so it must combine more support

for teaching improvement projects on the campuses and a thorough and continuing review of their purposes and uses with investment in the sharing of ideas across campuses. Such a process should serve not only SUNY better but also other university systems which are willing to learn from its experience.

THE RECOGNITION AND REWARD OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE

INTRODUCTION

In 1972, the State University of New York formally joined a national movement to evaluate the importance of teaching by inaugurating three university-wide programs; Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction (FGIUI), Excellence in Teaching Awards (EIT), and Distinguished Teaching Professorships (DTP). In 1975 SUNY was one of eleven institutions invited by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to participate in a national assessment of such programs. The purpose of SUNY's component of the national project were: (a) to understand how different programs contribute to the recognition and reward of good teaching; and (b) to make State University's current program more responsive to the needs of faculty. The project was of two-years duration.

During year I a three- phase study was undertaken by a research team from the Department of High Education at the University Center at Buffalo. Phase I surveyed a random sample of SUNY faculty to ascertain their awareness and general reactions to the three programs. Phase II surveyed those faculty who had applied for a grant or been nominated for an award (whether successful or not) to ascertain their perceptions of the selection process and program impact. Phase III produced case studies at a number of SUNY campuses of how the programs are implemented at the campus level. The results yielded a descriptive picture of the grants/awards program and recommendations for their improvement.

During year II, concerned as an outgrowth of activities engaged in during the first year of the project was on (a) dissemination of the results of the year I evaluation; (b) program improvement based upon those evaluations; and (c) experimentation with a process designed to build widespread support for enhancing the importance of teaching in SUNY.

To this end a series of regional conferences was held with recipients and awardees of the SUNY Programs. The intent of these conferences was to tap their collective impressions about the improvement of teaching; and to focus their attention on the program necessary to achieve it.

Combined results of the year I study and the evaluation of year II generated the conclusions and recommendations of this report.

PROCEDURES

YEAR I

An advisory committee consisting of students, faculty, and administrators, met with the project leaders in August of 1975 to assist in the design of the study. The design included the following components:

A. An historical and organizational analysis of the Program.

B. A Three-Phase Empirical Study of the Program.

1. Phase I - a "market survey" of 1500 randomly selected faculty to assess their awareness of and general attitudes toward the Program.

2. Phase II - a survey of all faculty who participated as award nominees or grant applicants to assess their preception of the Program and its procedures.

3. A series of interviews with faculty and staff on nine separate campuses to assess the implementation of the Program at the campus level.

C. An evaluation conference to report the results of the first-year to the SUNY Faculty Senate and to discuss plans for year II.

DATA-GATHERING

PHASE I Questionnaires for Phase 1 (Appendix A) were mailed to a simple random sample of 1100 faculty at SUNY University Centers, four-year colleges, specialized, agricultural/technical, and statutory colleges; and to a systematic sample of 400 faculty from a randomly selected group of 20 community colleges. Of the total sample, 862 or 57% returned usable questionnaires.

PHASE II The second phase of the study involved mailing a questionnaire (Appendix A) to all SUNY faculty who had participated in one or other of the three award programs since their inception. In all, 1200 questionnaires were sent to the following faculty:

1. All nominees for the Distinguished Teaching Professorship (DTP).
2. All nominees for the Excellence in Teaching Award (EIT).
3. A systematic sample from university central records of 800 faculty who had served as principal investigators on proposals for Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction.

In cases of overlap (where, for instance, a faculty member was both an award nominee and a grant principal investigator) only one questionnaire was sent.

PHASE II Questionnaires were returned by 688 faculty, a response rate of 55%. As shown in Appendix B, the four year colleges (34.3% of those responding) showed the largest proportions of respondents, followed by the Community Colleges (23.7%), and the University Centers (22.5%).

PHASE III* The unit of analysis for Phase III is the campus rather than the individual faculty member as in Phases I and II. The goal was to sample campuses in such a way as to permit SUNY-wide generalizations about how the program functioned in practice and with what consequences. Project resources did not permit visits to a large enough sample of campuses to fully represent each of the six SUNY campus types; so two research techniques, analytic induction and theoretical sampling were employed. Analytic induction is a strategy of analysis that directs the investigator to formulate generalizations, based on a single case, that apply to all instances of the problem with which he is concerned. At the same time the investigator searches for empirical instances that negate his nascent hypotheses, and modifies them to include the "negating evidence." The process is not complete until his theoretical generalizations have developed to account for all such negative cases.

Theoretical sampling is a procedure for selecting cases so that the chance of discovering a decisive negative case are maximized. Within the context of this project, theoretical sampling involved selection of campuses within each

* These procedures were developed and executed by Martin F. Finkelstein.

institutional type that markedly differed from each other on a number of salient dimensions, under the assumption that generalizations applicable across a pair of markedly contrasting campuses within a given institutional type as well as across several institutional types could be accepted with a higher degree of confidence in their validity.

Five dimensions along which campuses markedly differed were considered relevant,

1. The levels of campus participation in the three programs (relative to other campuses of their type). For the faculty grants program, the level of participation was determined by the number of grant submissions relative to the size of the campus; and for the teaching award program, level of participation was judged by the number of nominations made relative to the number of nominations for which a campus was eligible. Because a fixed ratio places a ceiling on the number of eligible nominees per campus there is less inherent variation among campuses in the teaching award programs than in the faculty grants program.

2. The degree of campus success in the three programs (relative to other campuses of their type). For the faculty grants program, success was judged by the ratio of grants received to grant applications. For the teaching awards program, success was judged by the ratio of teaching awards to nominations.

3. The pattern of campus participation over time. Did it decline, increase, or hold steady?

4. The campus climate or orientation. Three dimensions of climate/orientation were identified: a) Relative emphasis upon research and teaching; b) Balance between liberal arts and vocational technical education; and C) Progressiveness or conservatism of educational philosophy.

5. Campus size. Based on the number of full-time equivalent students.

Ideally, a pair of campuses would have been selected within each institutional type which showed the most marked contrast on the five dimensions. Contrasting pairs were selected for the university centers, the four year colleges, and the community colleges only since these three campus types enroll by far the largest proportion of students and employ the largest proportion of faculty. One campus each was chosen from among the agricultural and technical colleges, the statutory colleges, and the specialized colleges. In the agricultural and technical category,

very little internal variation on the five dimensions was found, except for size. Statutory and specialized colleges were chosen so as to form together a contrasting pair. It should be noted that although we sought maximal contrast, campuses that had not participated in one program or another were excluded from the sample since they could provide no data on program operations.

Case Study Procedures

Preliminary contacts were initiated with each of the nine campuses and 15 to 10 key individuals were identified to be interviewed. These key individuals included:

1. Individuals directly involved in the program administration on the campus: For the faculty grants program these included:
   a. The campus coordinator during the 1972-73 academic year;
   b. the individual or individuals responsible for disseminating information about the program and for routing proposals to SUNY Central (usually in the research office);
   c. the individual or individuals who assist in the proposal development process;
   d. any individual currently involved in the campus review of proposals prior to their submission to SUNY Central for the teaching awards program, chairpersons of the faculty and student screening committees and nominating committee.
2. Campus faculty and administrators who are involved in administration of the programs at the SUNY Central level. For the faculty grants program, these included members of the Central Awards Committee or reviewers of the Central Awards Committee. For the teaching awards program, they included members of the Chancellor's Joint Advisory Committee;
3. Individuals involved in instructional development and instructional policy on campus. There generally were the director of learning resources or the educational communication center, the director of campus-based program in instructional or faculty development, and the chairpersons of faculty or college-wide committee concerned with instructional policy, teaching and/or evaluation of teaching.
4. Individuals involved in the promotion and tenure structure of the campus. These included chairpersons, divisional and all-college tenure committees, and deans or chief academic officers.

5. Individuals from a cross section of the academic departments with contrasting patterns of participation and success in the three programs;

Semi-structured interviews were held on each campus with the individuals described above, allowing them to develop their own perceptions with a minimum of investigator direction. The interviewer began by asking the respondent to describe his or her involvement with the program, and subsequent discussion was then shifted to the areas about which the individual had information. As working hypotheses and generalizations emerged, the interviews became slightly more structured. Attempts were made to elicit from respondents evidence that would either confirm, deny or qualify the working hypothesis and generalizations.

Analysis of Data

Interviews and Content Analysis. Information gathered by the examination of University Policy Statements and by discussion with Central Administration Staff yielded a description of the award program structure and procedures. In addition, results of the interviews in Phase III generated a description of the way those policies and procedures were perceived and implemented on individual SUNY campuses. Participation statistics are reported in Tables 1 to 8 of Appendix B.

Analysis of Questionnaire Results. Summary data on all items were reported in the form of percentage distribution. These are shown in Tables 4 and 10 of Appendix B. Additional secondary analyses of these data, carried out during year 2, yielded results which are reported in the same Appendix. Those items for which significant difference across certain classification variables were found, are so designated in the right-hand column of the table. The variables used for assessing group differences included:

For Phase I:

1. Type of campus at which respondent taught

Code		Description
Center	-	University Center
4 - year	-	Four-year College
Community College	-	Community College
Other	-	Statutory colleges, Agricultural and Technical Colleges, Specialized Colleges

2. Rank of Respondent

Code		Description
Instr.	-	Instructor
Lect.	-	Lecturer
Assist. Professor	-	Assistant Professor
Assoc. Professor	-	Associate Professor
Full Professor	-	Full Professor

3. Whether or not respondent applied for or was nominated for an award.

Code		Description
Non-Participant	-	Respondent who neither applied for a grant nor was nominated for an award.
Nominee	-	Respondent who applied for a grant or was nominated for an award.

For Phase II: Award Program Participants

1. Type of campus (same as Phase I)

2. Rank of Respondent (same as Phase II)

3. Respondent Status with Regard to Award Program

Code		Description
Nominee	-	Respondent was nominated for EIT or DTP
Recipient	-	Respondent received a Faculty Grant for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction

Because of the recommendation and decision-oriented nature of this study, only those differences which were statistically significant beyond P. < .01 (fewer

than 1 chance in 100 that differences occurred by chance), were included in the tables. Results of the group-difference analysis are discussed along with the basic descriptive analyses for each Phase.

YEAR II

Regional Conferences. During the Spring of 1976 a decision was made to organize during the second year of the Project a series of regional conferences for grant applicants and award nominees. To solicit participant ideas about the meetings, a questionnaire was sent to approximately 400 of those award program participants who were eligible to attend. The results of that survey (Table 11) were used to design the first set of conferences.

The meetings were held in Fall and Spring, in four different regions of the state so that participants would not have to travel over-night to attend. Individual expenses of the participants were covered by the grant, as were all expenses of the arrangements and evaluation.

Coordination of each conference was by one or more award participant using staff assistance from Buffalo and Albany.

Evaluation

At each conference one or more members of the project staff took notes and/or tape recorded the discussions. Points attended to for the evaluation included:

1. Reactions to the grants and awards program and suggestions for their improvement.

2. Participant attitudes toward teaching and its improvement, including teaching methods considered to be good and bad, teacher attitude considered effective and ineffective, and conditions considered facilitating and hindering of good teaching.

After each conference, feedback was received from the coordinators and from project staff, were used in the planning of subsequent meetings, and were compiled to provide information for the final evaluation. From this evaluation a series of conclusions and recommendations emerged.

RESULTS

YEAR I

STRUCTURE AND PROCEDURES

The faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction (FGIUI), which developed as a "teaching foundation" analogous to SUNY's Faculty Awards for Research, provides grants of up to $2,000 for instructional improvement projects. The Distinguished Teaching Professorship (DTP), which was designed to accord prestige equivalent to that above Full Professor and a permanent salary increment of up to $2,500. The Excellence in Teaching Award (EIT), designed to recognize faculty without the requisite length of service for the DTP, provides a $500 one-time cash award and a certificate of recognition by the Chancellor.

All three programs are funded directly by the Chancellor with monies provided from overhead on grants and contracts, and are administered through the office of the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Central Awards Committee on the basis of system-wide review of grant proposals. Decisions to award Distinguished Teaching Professorship and Excellence in Teaching Awards are made by the Chancellor from lists of nominees submitted by campus presidents and reviewed by a Joint Advisory Committee and the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Policy.

Participation in Award Programs

As shown in Table 1, Appendix B, during the four years of the faculty grants program, over 2,100 proposals have been submitted requesting almost 2.6 million dollars and involving over 1,500 faculty members from 68 of the State University's 72 campuses. One hundred-sixty projects involving 213 faculty members on 37

SUNY campuses have been funded for a total of over $334,000. Although applications have come from faculty at nearly 95% of the eligible campuses, individuals at only half the campuses have received awards, disproportionately more at University Centers, Four-year colleges, and Agricultural and Technical colleges. The number of applications declined abruptly after the first year...from 421 in 1972-73 to 238 in 1973-74.

As shown in Table 2 faculty in the Natural Sciences have submitted the most applications (408) but have had the poorest success rate (12%) while faculty in the Humanities have submitted far fewer (163) with a slightly higher success rate (17%), the highest success rate for all disciplines. Grants have been distributed equally among junior and senior faculty, with Associate Professors receiving the most. (Table 3)

Excellence in Teaching Awards (EIT)

During the three years for which data are available, 51 campuses have nominated 402 faculty for EIT awards, and with 286 awards made. (Table 4) Nearly every campus that submitted nominations has received at least oneaward. Most awards have been given to faculty in the Social Sciences and Natural Sciences with substantially fewer going to faculty in the Fine Arts or in Professional Schools. (Table 5)

Distinguished Teaching Professorship (DTP)

As shown in Table 6 during the first three years of the program, 25 of 54 faculty nominated have been designated as DTP's with most coming from the Natural and Social Sciences and very few from Professional Fields. (Table 7) Sixteen of the 21 campuses who have nominated faculty for DTP have been successful.

Faculty Awareness of the Program: Results of Phase I

Fifty-seven percent of the 1,500 randomly selected SUNY faculty responded to the Phase I survey of awareness and general attitudes about the award programs. As shown in Table 9 only some 37% of those responding indicated that they knew much about the programs, with information coming most often via departmental communications and least often from campus presidents or SUNY Central. The information dissemination with which faculty were most satisfied was that dealing with grant and award logistics (application procedures, deadlines, and types of fundable projects), while information dissemination about proposal review and award nomination and selection criteria was viewed as less adequate.

Although a large proportion of faculty felt that rewards for teaching excellence and grants to develop improved instruction were effective approaches to encouraging and rewarding good teaching, 85% indicated that the SUNY awards and grants programs had little or no impact on the importance accorded teaching, which had remained generally the same over the past few years. Evidently, encouraging and rewarding good teaching does not itself have much impact on the importance accorded it.

Yet faculty support the programs, feel that the money spent on them is well-spent, and do not believe that remediation of weaker teachers is preferable to recognizing good ones. On the contrary, many feel that current policies do not sufficiently direct grants and awards to those who most deserve them, and that campuses whose mission is primarily teaching should receive a greater share. The programs are viewed by large majorities of faculty as just as important as publications and research grants for promotion, tenure, and sabbatical authorizations.

Winning a teaching award or an instructional grant is an important professional aspiration for over 70% of the faculty, exceeded in importance only by

the aspiration to write and/or publish (80%), and by the aspiration to continue doing what they are currently doing (93%). One can interpret this latter percentage as evidence of general faculty fulfillment or as evidence of intertia; but it suggests that involvement in the grants and award programs is clearly seen as extra activity, and may require special facilitation.

Participant Attitudes: Findings of Phase II

Fifty-five percent of the 1,200 participants (grant applicants or award nominees, successful or unsuccessful) in the programs responded to the Phase II survey of their attitudes about the process and outcomes of involvement.

As shown in Table 10, the only real impact of participation seems to have been heightened personal satisfaction. In a majority of cases, little or no impact was seen on departmental status, effectiveness as a teacher, involvement in teaching improvement efforts, being called upon as a consultant, student satisfaction with teacher, interaction with students in class, and teaching style... all stayed about the same.

But again, as with faculty generally, participants did not want to see any of the programs eliminated. Improvements were suggested, including a wider spread of smaller grants and awards and better coordination of them with campus curricular planning---implying that the keys to greater impact may be diffusion and integration rather than increase of resources allocated.

The Selection Process

Teaching award nominees favor selection criteria which reflect a progressive notion of "teachers responsible for student development" rather than the more traditional view of "scholars who teach". Thus they favor such criteria as high standards for student achievement and academic excellence, concern for the intellectual and social growth of individual students, generosity with time, and easy

accessibility. They generally reject the criteria of scholarship as demonstrated through publications or artistic productions.

Instructional grant applicants concentrate on the qualities of the proposal as crucial to success. Such criteria as feasibility, well-explained goals and rationale, clearly stated and attainable objectives, documentation of staff capability, innovativeness in substance and methodology, and expected benefit to students are viewed as most important; while criteria of importance to administrators such as potential number of students to be helped, repeatability of the project, and campus support are seen by participants as of less importance.

After an idea for a project was translated into a decision to apply for a SUNY Faculty Grant (most often because funds were not readily available elsewhere) the project was generally developed through discussion with colleagues, technical experts, and students. Far less often were the traditional research channels such as conference papers, articles, or books used, suggesting a need for communication networks rather than instructional resource centers as aids to grant attainment.

Impact of Success

Grant recipients generally continued their projects after the grant expired and reported that the project's greatest impact was upon students rather than upon the instructional process. As a consequence of programs implemented via instructional grants, recipients felt that students enjoyed their experiences more, learned something different, and retained what they learned longer. They did not learn the same with less investment of campus resources, nor learn the same amount with less effort. Clearly the recipients did not stress the resource-saving, efficiency aspects of instructional grants, nor think them very important.

Group Differences

During the second year of the Project, a series of secondary analyses were carried out on the Phase I and Phase II Questionnaire responses. Analyses of variance by campus type, rank of respondent, and type of participation in the program yielded a more sensitive picture of faculty awareness of and response to the grants and award Program. The differences found to be statistically significant are listed in Tables 9 and 10 opposite the items to which they pertain. A brief summary of differences appears in Appendix C.

In general, the comparisons yielded several different images of SUNY-system faculty as considered from different perspectives.

Faculty at University centers seemed less interested in the technical aspects of teaching improvement and more in tune with the notion that good teaching derives more indirectly from the usual research and scholarly pursuits. Thus they seemed to desire more straight information about system procedures such as types of projects for which grants were made available, application procedures, and deadlines; and felt that assistance from instructional development specialists was not as important in encouraging them to design an instructional improvement project. In general, while they felt that receiving a promotion or tenure was important, they considered winning a teaching award to be less of a contributory factor to such promotion and were generally less inclined to view external aids as important to encourage good teaching. Thus campus workshops, rewards for teaching excellence, centers for instructional improvement, conferences, and outside consultants did not receive strong endorsement. University Center faculty, insofar as teaching improvement is concerned, retain their traditionalist, autonomous-scholar image.

The image of faculty at the four-year colleges reflects a more local orientation to teaching and a higher relative sense of its importance. Thus they felt

that the impact awards had on teaching was more at the department level, reflecting no doubt the tendency reported elsewhere of certain departments (in 4-year colleges) to make winning an award a high priority. They also reported that office space was an important consideration in whether or not to seek an instructional improvement grant, and believed that campus administrators should have more influence in selecting award recipients. The picture of an institutional, even departmental, thrust among four-year college faculty contrasts markedly with the more extra-campus orientation of faculty at University Centers.

Community College faculty reflected an even stronger orientation to teaching, believing that teaching awards and instructional improvement grants should be more important than publications or research grants in promotion and tenure decisions. The view by community college faculty that SUNY Central Staff should have less influence in the selection process may reflect discomfiture at a system regulation preventing community college faculty from being eligible for Distinguished Teaching Professorships.

Comparisons of faculty of different ranks yielded a different set of images that may or may not be independent of institutional types.

Full and associate professors seemed to know more about the grants and awards program, and were generally more satisfied with the information they received (more often from the campus President's Office) about types of projects for which instructional improvement grants are given, and about review criteria and procedures. They were distinguished in their attitudes only in being less inclined toward centers for instructional improvement as an approach to encouraging and rewarding good teaching; and in not supporting the idea that money now spent recognizing good teachers would be better spent helping weaker teachers improve.

Instructors and assistant professors were less informed about the awards program and aspired less to publishing and/or receiving a research grant during the

coming years; but still held promotion and tenure to be important aspirations. Perhaps advising students (which was a more important aspiration for them) or teaching (for which they were more inclined to advocate the use of student evaluations of instruction) are seen as the primary avenues to advancement. Such a view held by those in four-year colleges and community colleges is likely to be rewarded; whereas a similar attitude held by younger faculty at University Centers is likely to hinder advancements.

Those who had been nominated for an award differed from those who had not in that their knowledge of the awards came more from intra-departmental communications, that they believed the award program had more impact on their department or division's view of the importance of teaching; and that receiving an award was an important aspiration for the coming year. It is hardly surprising that nomination and such attitudes go together, but rather difficult to determine which attitude is cause and which is effect.

Phase II Comparisons

The attitudes of those who had participated in the awards program were compared across several dimensions including campus type, faculty rank, and award nomination on reception. There were no significant differences on attitudes about participation across faculty ranks and very few distinctions between nominees and recipients. Grant recipients began their instructional improvement projects more as a consequence of a visceral feeling that some improvement was needed; and recipients (more than nominees) felt both an increase in their professional satisfaction and in their effectiveness as a teacher.

Participants (both nominees and recipients) from University Centers remained in favor of keeping the grants and awards and seemed inclined not to be rigid about specific eligibility guidelines for the awards, even though they felt that both their departmental status and the amount of faculty/student interaction in their course had decreased as a result of their award.

Community college participants felt more that learner outcomes and potential numbers of students to be benefitted should be a criterion for selection of grant recipients, were more inclined to eliminating the teaching awards (especially the Distinguished Teaching Professorship for which the community colleges are ineligible), and yet felt that both student satisfaction with their teaching and their departmental status had increased as a result of their participation in the awards/grants program.

In sum, while certain sub-group differences appear across campus type, faculty rank, and levels of participation, these differences reflect expected influences and do not contradict the general findings about the total faculty.

Program Implementation: Findings of Phase III

Nine SUNY campuses were visited to gather information about how the grants and award programs actually function and with what consequences. Over 100 interviews were held with program administrators and committee members, as well as with successful and unsuccessful program participants. Campuses were selected to provide maximum contrast on five dimensions: level of participation, degree of success, pattern of participation (decreasing, stable or increasing), campus size, and campus climate (defined by relative emphasis on research vs. teaching, liberal vs. technical education, and progressiveness vs. conservatism of educational philosophy). Findings from these case studies clarified and enriched the findings from the surveys of Phases I and II.

Faculty Grants Program - On most campuses, the FGIUI is treated as if it were any other extramural funding program in which faculty can participate as individuals. Most faculty do not distinguish the grants from other research grants, and consider them to be too small.

There is little or no integration of funded projects with departmental curricular planning; and department members are almost never aware that a colleague has submitted an application. Campus faculty who serve on the Central Awards Committee do not generally serve as a link between the campus and SUNY Central. They have never felt that such was their role.

Four factors were discovered which hinder faculty participation. They are:

1. The grant announcements arrive too late to permit careful preparation of a proposal.
2. Those initially motivated to submit proposals are discouraged by the high failure rate.
3. The low probability of success (which rapidly became widespread knowledge) led many to avoid even applying.
4. The small size of the grant made a large investment of faculty time not worth the effort.

When faculty do apply, success seems to be made more likely by the presence on campus of some person who takes responsibility to "push" the potential awardee ... first to decide to apply, and then to develop a strong proposal. Sometimes the "prime mover", is an assistant dean in charge of instructional development, or the director of a Learning Resources Center who informs faculty, cajoles them, and even helps write the proposal. On the campuses, the success rate is significantly higher. This "prime mover" role has at times been taken by a whole department which undertakes a grant project as a form of curricular or instructional revitalization.

The impact of a successful grant application is most positive for the individual awardees who feel that being awarded a grant has contributed to their professional development and to the experience of their students. But rarely are there significant changes in departmental curricular or instructional methods or in enhancing the importance of teaching, except where the grant project itself involved departmental reorganization or where the department was unusually collegial.

One major concern voiced by grant recipients was the apparent lack of follow-through by Central Administration, either for disseminating the results of successful projects or for explaining to unsuccessful applicants the reasons for rejection.

The Teaching Awards - To faculty, winning a teaching award (whether EIT or DTP) carries more prestige than receiving a grant and a majority of faculty support the program's concept and goals.

Opposition in principle to the awards by a minority of faculty took several forms including:

a) The awards represent "tokenism" by Central Administration rather than acceptance of responsibility for the real improvement of teaching.

b) The "star" orientation of the awards singles out individuals at the expense of group solidarity (a union view) or of departmental collegiality (a view of departments working as a group to improve instruction).

c) Spending money on awards in a time of fiscal crisis is irresponsible (a view of those who would expect unused award funds to flow into campus operating budgets).

The majority of faculty, however, find the award programs laudable but lacking credibility, because success seems to depend on factors irrelevant to teaching excellence. Some of the factors alluded to were:

1. Unless a person in the potential nominee's department sets the nomination process in motion, many faculty are reluctant to "push" their own candidacy (even to the extent of preparing their own dossier). Thus with awards as well as grants, a "prime mover" is necessary.

2. Conversely, those faculty with the "chutzpah" to prepare and advertise their case stood a greater chance of being successful, regardless of actual teaching excellence.

3. Faculty in specialized departments or in those open to majors have a lower probability of being nominated because their teaching does not attract the attention of a large segment of the student body.

4. Faculty in departments which emphasize cooperative approaches to instructional improvement have less chance of being nominated because their departments will not single out one individual for special honor.

5. Faculty whose teaching excellence could be more readily documented have a greater chance of being nominated and selected. Campus screening

committees tend to be more inclined to select as nominees those whose dossiers contain more than student evaluations and colleague testimonials. This usually means that those dossiers buttressed by a substantial publication list are given preference.

Another source of concern is that nominations are sometimes used to reward faculty for departmental or campus-wide service when conventional rewards are unavailable. In one case a DTP nomination was given to a senior professor upon retirement. In another, an EIT nomination was made to compensate a professor for having carried an extra teaching load.

A final source of concern relates to perceptions and practices of screening committees which arbitrarily limit the pool of potential nominees. These are:

1. That Teaching awards constitute recognition for doing an excellent job with a particular course. Thus younger faculty or newer faculty are eliminated who haven't yet become identified with "their own course."

2. That "great teacher" is synonomous with "great lecturer." Those who have not taught large lecture courses or who are at their best in advanced seminars simply do not have as much chance.

3. That nominees for DTP who are not selected are automatically shifted to EIT competition, thus effectively squeezing out junior faculty for whom the EIT program was intended.

4. That the campus nominating committees are adhoc arrangements with no continuity from year to year, and no organizational link to committees or units concerned with the improvement of teaching.

Impact of the Awards

Winning an award brings personal pleasure to the recipient and a certain amount of recognition (primarily from off-campus colleagues); but also subjects the winner to a host of committee assignments relating to the administrative aspects of teaching improvement, which are difficult to turn down. DTP's often indicated that one result of winning was having less time for research and even of suffering some loss of prestige as a researcher or scholar. For younger faculty, a teaching award might enhance an otherwise modest research record, but cannot substitute for a poor one.

A major disappointment was the failure of either the campus or Central Administration to follow through with publicity about the winners and/or use of the winner's skills to enhance teaching. Careful follow-through would not only link award recipients to instructional improvement efforts on campus but would improve selection procedures by giving public exposure to all winners.

Finally, it appears that the grants and awards programs involve a rather small nucleus (about 20 to 30) of the same faculty over and over. SUNY's major challenge in enhancing the importance of teaching is to expand that core pool ... to find ways to use the efforts of the few to generate a chain reaction among the many.

Recommendations of Year I

The following suggestions for improving the SUNY grants and award programs are based upon inferences drawn from the data of the study, and were used to generate discussion among faculty, administrations, and students about how teaching in SUNY can become more important and more effective. At the end of Year I, they were transmitted to SUNY Central Administration and responses were conveyed to the regional conferences.

1. Information about grants and awards should be disseminated as much as possible at the departmental or divisional level where it is most likely to reach the largest number of potential participants. This means that every eligible member should receive an announcement about the programs early in the academic year.

2. Special effort should be made to inform faculty at Agricultural and Technical Colleges and at Community Colleges about the availability of Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction.

3. There should be a University-wide commitment by all active participants to make as many SUNY faculty aware of the availability of grants and awards as possible.

4. The Chancellor or his designee should formally encourage all campuses to become active participants in the teaching award programs.

5. Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction should be given separate visibility by being distinguished as clearly as possible at the local campus level from research grants.

6. One individual on each campus should be formally designated to serve as principal administrative supporter (prime mover) for the nomination and application process for faculty grants and teaching awards. Such a person should develop networks of communication among faculty seeking to improve instruction.

7. The amount of campus-level resources dedicated to teaching awards and faculty grants should be increased, with campuses setting aside a portion of their operating budget for this purpose to supplement funds available from Central Administration.

8. Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction should be directed more to team efforts with faculty time for team members being assigned to course and curriculum development. Awards for team projects should be considerably larger than the current $2,000 per grant.

9. Efforts should be made on local campuses to link instructional grant projects to more general curriculum change within departments. To this end, much greater departmental commitment to securing instructional improvement grants and to making substantive use of teaching award winners is necessary.

10. Nominations for Excellence in Teaching Awards should be separate from Distinguished Teaching Professorships. There should be no presumption that unsuccessful ETP nominees should head the list of those being considered for EIT awards.

11. Any grant proposal or award nomination dossier should include a plan for the special use of the successful participant's skills or dissemination of the results of a project throughout the State University. SUNY Central publication resources should be made available for such dissemination.

YEAR II

Plans for the Regional Conferences

To solicit the views of potential participants about the regional conferences, a brief questionnaire was sent to 400 faculty. A total of 325 (81.3%) were returned. As shown in Appendix D, topics which seem most favorable for the agenda included:

1. New approaches to general or liberal education (56% of the respondents in favor)
2. Ways to improve SUNY's academic quality (63% in favor)
3. Intercampus cooperation (51% in favor)
4. The evaluation of teaching (70% in favor)

The group seemed to be split between those who wanted no definite outcomes or at most a general summary on the one hand, and those on the other hand who wanted definite recommendations to emerge from our meetings. The same was true on the organization of the agenda. About a third of the group wanted an agenda similar in all regions, whereas the others favored some form of separatism or openendedness. Almost half the group wanted cross-disciplinary meetings though 40% would like to have some of the meetings organized by discipline.

The group was not evenly divided geographically: 39% were in Coordinating Area I, 27% in Coordinating Area II, 14% in Coordinating Area III and 19% in Coordinating Area IV. This led to sub-groupings in Coordinating Areas I and II.

Almost 80% of the group were equally divided among social sciences, natural sciences or math. The remaining 20% are in business, education, engineering,

medicine and nursing, or technical fields, with roughly an even distribution among those areas. Excellence in Teaching awardees made up about 60% of the group, while another 30% are recipients of Faculty Grants, and the remaining 10% Distinguished Teaching Professors.

The Meetings

The meetings were diverse, in content, style, and form of participation. Separate descriptions of each meeting are available from the Project Director. A summary of participant reaction to the meetings is presented in Appendix E.

EVALUATION SUMMARY: YEAR II

The second year of the State University of New York component of National Project III had four major objectives:

A. To recognize faculty who had received teaching awards and instructional grants.

B. To use award winners and grant recipients as resource persons to improve the teaching award programs in the State University. Their expertise was believed to derive from their direct involvement making them uniquely qualified to suggest how awards might have more impact and wider diffusion.

C. To develop ongoing groups of faculty who foster the enhancement of teaching at the campus and inter-campus level. By bringing faculty together and making them aware of SUNY's interest in enhancing the importance of teaching, nucleus groups might work with each other and carry forward what had been begun by their involvement in the awards program.

D. To provide a forum in which faculty could review topics of importance to the system such as general education, relative roles of teaching and research in the University, and the formation of the teaching/learning institute suggested in the Master Plan.

An immediately apparent outcome of the meetings was the development of acquaintance among faculty members in terested in enhancing the importance of teaching. Faculty who had been deeply involved in teaching but who up to that time had very little contact with one another, were able to come together and discuss their mutual interest in teaching. This was a very beneficial outcome without regard to the content of the discussion.

The discussions ranged well beyond the first year Summary Report; but concentrated on the award/grant programs. As a result the award winners learned a great deal more about the programs and upon returning to their own campuses where many serve on screening committees were better able to disseminate the information further.

The recommendations generated by the early meetings were brought together and made the major agenda for a later meeting at which these recommendations were

refined; and then forwarded to the University Senate and Central Administration. (cf. Appendix C)

Another beneficial outcome of these meetings grew from discussion of the qualities of good teaching and the characteristics of different teaching styles. This led one group to organize its second meeting around an analysis of teaching styles in the humanities.

In other meetings steering committees were developed to carry forward the work of the groups and to plan for subsequent meetings and subsequent projects. These steering committees were seen as forerunners of the on-going groups the Project seeks to encourage.

The groups did not attain on-going status in which they were self generating and in which they controlled their own agendas and activities. There remained at the end of Year II too much reliance on the Project staff for decisions about where and when to hold meetings, and what the agenda should be. It was the intention of the Project to serve as a facilitating and helping agent but not to retain that leadership role any longer than necessary; but that leadership role was not successfully relinquished.

However, it became relatively clear that the award winners were generally more interested in their own teaching activities than in enhancing the importance of teaching throughout the system. Perhaps this was appropriate since those who receive teaching awards or instructional grants have already spent a great deal of time and effort trying to improve teaching at their own levels and have not directed that attention to system-wide problems. It may be that such firing-line individuals are not the appropriate ones to take a system-wide view of enhancing the importance of teaching. While not necessarily true for individuals, it may be that far better use of faculty time and resources would be to have them stay in the classroom rather than to consider the problems of teaching on a system-

basis. This was a common reaction among invited faculty members who reported that they enjoyed coming to the meeting but were continually beset by their own internal questions of whether or not their time might not be better spent in or preparing for the classroom.

Attendance at the conferences was considerably lower than anticipated leaving a portion of the budget untouched. Consideration was given to various ways that these funds could be used including:

A. Further meetings to devote themselves to project such as seminars on teaching, campus projects to enhance the importance of teaching and further refinement of the recommendations dealing with the teaching award programs. To each region money was made available for the development of separate projects.

B. Establishment of a small grants program for projects suggested by the award winners. The program would be competitive in that different individuals on different campuses would submit to the Project staff or to a steering committee made up of former award winners projects which they felt should be funded.

C. Identification of those whom the first year report designated as prime movers and bring them together to serve as more effective spreaders of NP III objective throughout SUNY.

D. Convening of those faculty who have attended the regional meetings as the nucleus of a committee to develop the teaching learning institute.

E. Development and dissemination of a resource document describing projects that had been awarded a faculty grant. This resource document would be made widely available so that interested faculty and administrators could share in the results of projects in other parts of the system.

APPENDIX A

Phase I and II Questionnaires

ELEVATING THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AND
FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

ELEVATING THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AND
FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

DECEMBER 1975

DEAR COLLEAGUE:

IN 1972, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK FORMALLY JOINED A GROWING NATIONAL MOVEMENT TO ELEVATE THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING BY INAUGURATING THREE UNIVERSITY-WIDE PROGRAMS: FACULTY GRANTS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION, EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AWARDS, AND DISTINGUISHED TEACHING PROFESSORSHIPS. THIS YEAR, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WAS ONE OF ELEVEN INSTITUTIONS INVITED BY THE FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE, TO PARTICIPATE IN A NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF SUCH PROGRAMS. THE PURPOSES OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY COMPONENT OF THE NATIONAL PROJECT ARE: (A) TO UNDERSTAND HOW DIFFERENT PROGRAMS CONTRIBUTE TO THE RECOGNITION AND REWARD OF GOOD TEACHING; AND (B) TO MAKE STATE UNIVERSITY'S CURRENT PROGRAMS MORE RESPONSIVE TO THE NEEDS OF FACULTY.

TO ASSURE A SEARCHING AND OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS OF THESE CONCERNS, AN INDEPENDENT RESEARCH TEAM AT THE UNIVERSITY CENTER AT BUFFALO WAS COMMISSIONED TO DESIGN AND EXECUTE THE STUDY IN CONSULTATION WITH COLLEAGUES ACROSS THE COUNTRY.

THE ENCLOSED QUESTIONNAIRE IS THE FIRST PHASE OF A TWO-YEAR RESEARCH EFFORT. IT IS BEING SENT TO A RANDOM SAMPLE OF 1500 FULL-TIME FACULTY AT THE STATE-OPERATED CAMPUSES AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF STATE UNIVERSITY. WE URGE THAT YOU READ THROUGH ALL THE QUESTIONS CAREFULLY AND ANSWER THEM AS THOUGHTFULLY AS YOUR TIME PERMITS. OUR PROCEDURES GUARANTEE THE ANONYMITY OF INDIVIDUAL RESPONDENTS, AND THE DATA YOU SUPPLY WILL BE USED ONLY AS AGGREGATE STATISTICS FOR OUR RESEARCH REPORTS THAT ADDRESS THE SUBSTANTIVE CONCERNS OF THE PROJECT.

WE APPRECIATE YOUR TAKING THE TIME TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS NATIONAL PROJECT FOR ENHANCING THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING. WE TRUST THAT YOUR EFFORT WILL BE REWARDED BOTH BY THE ADDED RESPONSIVENESS OF STATE UNIVERSITY'S TEACHING IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS TO YOU, YOUR STUDENTS, AND YOUR CAMPUS, AND BY YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO AN UNDERSTANDING OF HOW AN INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT TO TEACHING IMPROVEMENT CAN BEST BE IMPLEMENTED. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE OR THE PROJECT AS A WHOLE, PLEASE DO NOT HESITATE TO WRITE OR CALL US.

John Bruce Francis
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Frank Farmer
VISITING PROFESSOR
OF HIGHER EDUCATION

(716) 831-4237 OR 831-4806
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO

Instructions:

Please answer each question below. For those items for which a scale is provided, place the appropriate scale value in the box corresponding to the item. If you wish to indicate that you do not know the answer or have no opinion, place an "X" in the box.

1. How familiar are you with the SUNY teaching awards and grants to improve undergraduate instruction?

1	2	3	4	
no knowledge	vague familiarity	considerable familiarity	detailed knowledge	☐

2. Where did you learn about the SUNY teaching awards and grants to improve undergraduate instruction? (Check all that apply).

   a. Department or divisional communication ____

   b. Campus research office ____

   c. Campus President's office ____

   d. Campus newspaper ____

   e. SUNY Central office ____

   f. Other (Please specify) _____ ____

3. How satisfied are you with the information made available about each of the following aspects of the grants and awards programs?

1	2	3	4
very satisfied	somewhat satisfied	somewhat dissatisfied	very dissatisfied

a. Type of projects for which instructional improvement grants are given . . . . . ☐

b. Application procedures for instructional improvement grants . . . . . ☐

c. Deadlines for receipt of grant proposals or award nominations . . . . . ☐

d. Criteria and procedures for review of grant proposals . . . . . ☐

e. Nomination procedures for teaching awards . . . . . ☐

f. Criteria and procedures for selection of teaching award recipients . . . . . ☐

4. Over the past few years the importance accorded teaching by my department/division has:

1	2	3
increased	remained about the same	decreased

☐

5. How much impact have the SUNY grant and award programs had on the importance accorded teaching by your department/division?

1	2	3	4
a great deal	a moderate amount	rather little	none at all

☐

6. How important would the availability of each of the following be in encouraging you to design and execute a project for improving undergraduate instruction?

1	2	3	4
very important	somewhat important	somewhat unimportant	very unimportant

a. Supplemental pay . . . . . ☐

b. Released time . . . . . ☐

c. Summer grants . . . . . ☐

d. Office space . . . . . ☐

e. Technical assistance from instructional development specialists . . . . . ☐

f. Other (Please specify) _____ . . . . . ☐

7. How effective is each approach listed below in encouraging and rewarding good teaching?

1	2	3	4	
very effective	somewhat effective	somewhat ineffective	very ineffective	
a. Campus workshops on improving instruction				☐
b. Rewards for teaching excellence				☐
c. Public recognition for good teaching				☐
d. Student evaluation of instruction				☐
e. Centers for instructional improvement				☐
f. Professional association conferences on instructional improvement				☐
g. Provision of outside consultants				☐
h. Grants to develop improved instruction				☐
i. Other (Please specify) _____				☐

8. Listed below are professional aspirations you might have for the coming academic year. How important is each to you?

	1 very important	2 somewhat important	3 somewhat unimportant	4 very unimportant	
a.	Serve as a consultant in government or industry				☐
b.	Receive a teaching award or instructional grant				☐
c.	Spend more time advising students				☐
d.	Obtain a research grant				☐
e.	Be elected to College/University Senate				☐
f.	Become an institutional administrator (e.g. chairperson, dean)				☐
g.	Receive tenure or a promotion				☐
h.	Write and/or publish				☐
i.	Continue what I am now doing				☐

9. How important a role should each of the following play in developing ways to recognize and reward good teaching?

1 very important	2 somewhat important	3 somewhat unimportant	4 very unimportant	
a. Academic Departments				☐
b. State Education Department				☐
c. Federal agencies (e.g. NSF, NIMH)				☐
d. Individual campus administration				☐
e. Professional associations				☐
f. Professional unions				☐
g. SUNY Central Administration				☐

10. Using the scale below, please indicate how important receiving a teaching award should be relative to publications in:

1 Teaching Award More Important	2 Teaching Award Equally Important	3 Teaching Award Less Important	
a. Promotion/Tenure decisions			☐
b. Sabbatical Authorizations			☐

11. How much influence should each of the following groups have in selecting recipients of of teaching awards and instructional grants?

1	2	3	4
a great deal	a moderate amount	only slightly	not at all

	Awards	Grants
a. Faculty	☐	☐
b. Students	☐	☐
c. SUNY Central staff	☐	☐
d. Outside experts in instructional development	☐	☐
e. Campus administrators	☐	☐
f. Lay public	☐	☐
g. Professional unions	☐	☐
h. Other (Please specify) _____	☐	☐

12. Using the scale below, please indicate how important receiving an instructional grant should be relative to receiving a research grant in:

a. Promotion/Tenure decisions	☐
b. Sabbatical Authorizations	☐

1	2	3
Instructional Grants more important	Instructional Grants equally important	Instructional Grants less important

13. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:

1	2	3	4
strongly agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	strongly disagree

a. The money spent for grants to improve undergraduate instruction is well spent. . . . ☐

b. Generally, the individuals who deserve grants for instructional development do not receive them. . . . . ☐

c. The money spent for teaching awards is well spent. . . . . ☐

d. Generally, the individuals who deserve awards for excellence in teaching do not receive them. . . . . ☐

e. Since teaching is their job, faculty should not be given special recognition for good teaching. . . . . ☐

f. Money now spent to recognize good teachers would be better spent to help weaker teachers improve. . . . . ☐

g. Campuses whose mission is primarily teaching should receive a larger share of the awards. . . . . ☐

14. On what type of campus do you teach?

☐ University Center ☐ Four-year College ☐ Community College

☐ Statutory College ☐ Agricultural and Technical College ☐ Specialized College

15. What is your present faculty rank?

Instructor ☐ Lecturer ☐ Assistant Professor ☐

Associate Professor ☐ Full Professor ☐ Distinguished Professor ☐

16. In which department or division do you teach? _____

17. What is your age? _____ years

18. What is your highest academic degree? _____ From what institution was it received? _____

19. How long have you been a full-time faculty member at your present institution? _____ years

In SUNY? _____ years

In post-secondary education? _____ years

20. Are you presently tenured? ___ yes ___ no

21. What proportion of your work was devoted to the following activities during the past academic year (1974-1975)? Please use percentages that sum to 100%.

Teaching	___ %
Advisement	___ %
Research	___ %
Governance	___ %
Professional service	___ %
Other (Please specify)_____	___ %
Total	100%

22. Have you ever applied for an instructional improvement grant or been nominated for a teaching award?

___ yes ___ no

YOU HAVE NOW COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE AND FOLLOW THE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RETURNING.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RETURNING:

1. Fold back the next page.
2. Fold the questionnaire in half so the return address shows.
3. Fasten the bottom edges together with tape or staples.
4. Mail the questionnaire.

We very much appreciate your having taken the time to aid us in this research study.

National Project III
State University of New York at Buffalo
Department of Higher Education
16 Foster Annex, Main Campus
Buffalo, New York 14214

ELEVATING THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AND
FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

ELEVATING THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AND
FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

MARCH 1976

DEAR COLLEAGUE:

IN 1972, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK FORMALLY JOINED A GROWING NATIONAL MOVEMENT TO ELEVATE THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING BY INAUGURATING THREE UNIVERSITY-WIDE PROGRAMS: FACULTY GRANTS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION, EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AWARDS, AND DISTINGUISHED TEACHING PROFESSORSHIPS. THIS YEAR, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK WAS ONE OF ELEVEN INSTITUTIONS INVITED BY THE FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE, TO PARTICIPATE IN A NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF SUCH PROGRAMS. THE PURPOSE OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY COMPONENT OF THE NATIONAL PROJECT ARE: (A) TO UNDERSTAND HOW DIFFERENT PROGRAMS CONTRIBUTE TO THE RECOGNITION AND REWARD OF GOOD TEACHING: AND (B) TO MAKE STATE UNIVERSITY'S CURRENT PROGRAMS MORE RESPONSIVE TO THE NEEDS OF FACULTY.

TO ASSURE A SEARCHING AND OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS OF THESE CONCERNS, AN INDEPENDENT RESEARCH TEAM AT THE UNIVERSITY CENTER AT BUFFALO WAS COMMISSIONED TO DESIGN AND EXECUTE THE STUDY IN CONSULTATION WITH COLLEAGUES ACROSS THE COUNTRY.

THE ENCLOSED QUESTIONNAIRE IS THE SECOND PHASE OF A TWO-YEAR RESEARCH EFFORT. IT IS BEING SENT TO ALL SUNY FACULTY WHO HAVE BEEN NOMINATED FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AWARDS OR DISTINGUISHED TEACHING PROFESSORSHIPS AND ALL SUNY FACULTY WHO HAVE SUBMITTED GRANT PROPOSALS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION. WE URGE THAT YOU READ THROUGH ALL THE QUESTIONS CAREFULLY AND ANSWER THEM AS THOUGHTFULLY AS YOUR TIME PERMITS. THE DATA YOU SUPPLY WILL BE USED ONLY AS AGGREGATE STATISTICS FOR OUR RESEARCH REPORTS THAT ADDRESS THE SUBSTANTIVE CONCERNS OF THE PROJECT.

WE APPRECIATE YOUR TAKING THE TIME TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS NATIONAL PROJECT FOR ENHANCING THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING. WE TRUST THAT YOUR EFFORT WILL BE REWARDED BOTH BY THE ADDED RESPONSIVENESS OF STATE UNIVERSITY'S TEACHING IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS TO YOU, YOUR STUDENTS, AND YOUR CAMPUS, AND BY YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO AN UNDERSTANDING OF HOW AN INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT TO TEACHING IMPROVEMENT CAN BEST BE IMPLEMENTED. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE OR THE PROJECT AS A WHOLE, PLEASE DO NOT HESITATE TO WRITE OR CALL US.

JOHN BRUCE FRANCIS
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO
(716) 636-2480

1. Please indicate the number of times since 1972 you have been:

A Recipient of an Instructional Grant _____

An Applicant for an Instructional Grant _____

A Recipient of an Excellence in Teaching Award _____

A Nominee for an Excellence in Teaching Award _____

A Recipient of a Distinguished Teaching Professorship _____

A Nominee for a Distinguished Teaching Professorship _____

2. How much has each of the following changed as a result of your participation in the grant or award programs?

1 has increased a great deal	2 has increased a moderate amount	3 has stayed about the same	4 has decreased a moderate amount	5 has decreased a great deal
a. My status in my department				☐
b. My effectiveness as a teacher				☐
c. My sense of professional satisfaction				☐
d. My general involvement in teaching improvement on the campus				☐
e. The extent to which I have been consulted by administrators and colleagues on the improvement of teaching				☐
f. Student satisfaction with my teaching				☐
g. The amount of faculty-student interaction in my course				☐
h. My teaching style				☐

70 Please comment on any of the above

_____

_____

3. The faculty grants program and teaching awards programs could be improved by: (Check as many as you feel apply).

a. Increasing the number of grants _____

b. Increasing the number of awards _____

c. Increasing the amount of money per project _____

d. Increasing the amount of the cash award _____

e. Relating the grants to campus curricular planning _____

f. Relating the awards to campus curricular planning _____

4. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following:

1	2	3	4
strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree

a. The Distinguished Teaching Professorship Award should be eliminated ☐

b. The Excellence in Teaching Award should be eliminated . . . . . ☐

c. The Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction should be eliminated . . . . . ☐

PLEASE RESPOND TO QUESTIONS 5 AND 6 ONLY IF YOU HAVE BEEN NOMINATED FOR OR RECEIVED A TEACHING AWARD. (OTHERWISE SKIP TO QUESTION 7.)

5. Please indicate your agreement with inclusion of the following criteria for selection of teaching awards:

1	2	3	4
strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree

a. Mastery of several teaching techniques . . . . . ☐

b. Flexible instructional policy which adapts readily to student needs, interests, and problems . . . . . ☐

c. Generosity with personal time and easy accessibility. . . . . ☐

d. Continual concern with the intellectual and social growth of individual students . . . . . ☐

e. High standards for student achievement and academic excellence of students . . . . . ☐

f. Evidence of student evaluation that discriminates among final levels of competence . . . . . ☐

g. Recommendation for an award can only go to a faculty member who has regularly carried a normal teaching load for his/her campus . . . . . ☐

h. General scholarship, demonstrated through publications or artistic production . . . . . ☐

6. **Please describe the type of instructor you feel receives teaching effectiveness awards.**

PLEASE RESPOND TO QUESTIONS 7 THROUGH 11 IF YOU HAVE APPLIED FOR OR RECEIVED A GRANT TO IMPROVE UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION. (OTHERWISE SKIP TO QUESTION 12.)

7. How important were the following antecedent conditions in suggesting the need for your proposed project?

1	2	3	4
very important	somewhat important	somewhat unimportant	somewhat unimportant

a. Student dissatisfaction with a course or program . . . . . ☐

b. Peer or colleague dissatisfaction with a course or program . . . . . ☐

c. A change in departmental emphasis . . . . . ☐

d. A change in colleague emphasis . . . . . ☐

e. A visceral feeling . . . . . ☐

f. Decreasing enrollments . . . . . ☐

g. A change in, or addition to, my field, discipline or profession. . . . . ☐

h. Hearing about success with the idea elsewhere . . . . . ☐

i. A change or imporvement in instructional technology . . . . . ☐

j. A low rating by an accrediting body . . . . . ☐

k. Other (please specify)_____

8. How important were the following circumstances in stimulating you to apply for a SUNY Faculty Grant for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction?

1	2	3	4
very important	somewhat important	somewhat unimportant	very unimportant

a. Encouragement from departmental or college administrators . . . . . ☐

b. Encouragement from colleagues . . . . . ☐

c. Lack of available money from other funding sources . . . . . ☐

d. Lack of available money from regular departmental or college sources ☐

e. Stimulation by the announcement of the SUNY Grants program . . . . . ☐

f. Hearing about a colleague's project having been funded . . . . . ☐

g. Other (please specify) . . . . . ☐

9. How important were each of the following in influencing your thinking about the development of your project?

1	2	3	4
very important	somewhat important	somewhat unimportant	very unimportant

a. Discussions with colleagues in your discipline (at your institution or elsewhere) . . . . . ☐

b. Discussions with individuals in fields which support instructional improvement (e.g., media specialists, education specialists, etc.) . ☐

c. Discussions with students . . . . . ☐

d. A paper heard at a professional meeting . . . . . ☐

e. Article in a discipline-related journal . . . . . ☐

f. Articles in educational or psychological journal . . . . . ☐

g. Books and/or monographs . . . . . ☐

h. Other (please specify) _____

10. Please indicate your agreement with inclusion of the following criteria for selection of grants for improving undergraduate instruction.

1 strongly agree	2 agree	3 disagree	4 strongly disagree

a. Well explained goals and rationale . . . . . ☐

b. Clearly stated and attainable objectives . . . . . ☐

c. Documentation of adequacy and capability of staff for project implementation . . . . . ☐

d. Reasonableness of project budget . . . . . ☐

e. Innovative in substance . . . . . ☐

f. Innovative in methodology . . . . . ☐

g. Equality of distribution of grants among institutional types and disciplines . . . . . ☐

h. Some degree of campus support . . . . . ☐

i. Repeatability of project . . . . . ☐

j. Positive results in terms of student-learner outcomes . . . . . ☐

k. Potential <u>number</u> of students to be benefited . . . . . ☐

l. Feasibility in terms of time-frame, type of campus and students involved . . . . . ☐

11. Briefly describe the type of grant you feel receives funding.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

PLEASE RESPOND TO QUESTIONS 12 THROUGH 14 ONLY IF YOU HAVE <u>RECEIVED</u> A FACULTY GRANT FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION. (OTHERWISE SKIP TO QUESTION 15.)

12. Which of the following descriptions best characterizes the <u>present</u> state of the results of your project?

a. It is being continued in original form _____

b. It was reduced in scope but is being continued _____

c. It is being continued in expanded form _____

d. It was cancelled _____

e. Other (please specify) _____

Please comment: _____

_____

_____

_____

13. To your knowledge is the program or course you developed being used by other instructors? Check those categories for which your answer is yes.

In your department _____

In other departments _____

In other colleges or universities _____

14. Please rate the extent to which your project has contributed to either instructional effectiveness or efficiency in the following areas. Use the scale provided.

1	2	3	4
to a great extent	considerable	a little	not at all

a. More students learn the material . . . . . ☐

b. Students retain what they learn longer . . . . . ☐

c. Students learn the <u>same</u> with less resources investment . . . . . ☐

d. Students learn the same by working less . . . . . ☐

e. Students enjoy the experience more . . . . . ☐

f. Students learn something different ... . ☐

15. Did nomination or receiving of your award or grant produce any unanticipated results?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. On what type of campus do you teach?

University Center _____ Four-year College _____

Statutory College _____ Community College _____

Agricultural and Technical College _____ Specialized College _____

17. What is your present faculty rank?

Instructor _____ Assistant Professor _____

Lecture _____ Associate Professor _____

Full Professor _____ Distinguished Professor _____

18. In which department or division do you teach? _____

19. What is your age? _____

20. What is your highest academic degree?

21. How many years have you been a full-time faculty member at your present institution? _____

in SUNY? _____

in postsecondary education? _____

22. Are you presently tenured? _____

23. What proportion of your work was devoted to the following activities during the past academic year (1974-1975)? Please use percentages that sum to 100%.

Teaching	_____
Advisement	_____
Research	_____
Governance	_____
Professional Service	_____
Other*	_____
	100%

* Please specify _____

_____

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RETURNING:

1. Fold back the next page.
2. Fold the questionnaire in half so the return address shows.
3. Fasten the bottom edges together with tape or staples.
4. Mail the questionnaire.

We very much appreciate your having taken the time to aid us in this research study.

FIRST CLASS
PERMIT NO. 21
ALBANY, NY

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

No Postage Necessary if Mailed in The United States

Postage will be paid by

National Project III
State University of New York
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12210

Attention: Dr. J. Bruce Francis

National Project III
Elevating the Importance of Teaching
State University of New York at Buffalo
Department of Higher Education
16 Foster Annex, Main Campus
Buffalo, New York 14214

APPENDIX B

Tables of Results

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF GRANT APPLICATIONS[1]/AWARDS[2]
BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE (1972-1975)

Institutional Type	Eligible Campuses	Year 72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	Total (All Yrs.)
Univ. Centers	4	100/14	45/9	49/14	31/4	225/41
4-Yr. Colleges	14	139/17	106/17	146/19	100/16	491/66
Special Colleges	5	19/1	9/0	5/0	6/0	39/1
Agri. & Tech.	6	44/5	19/3	24/4	35/7	122/19
Statutory Col.	5	11/2	10/5	9/4	13/1	43/12
Community Col.	38	108/9	49/4	61/2	40/6	258/21
Total (All Types)	72	421/45	238/28	294/43	223/43	1178/160

1. Number of applications submitted.
2. Number of grants awarded.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF PROPOSALS/AWARDS BY DISCIPLINE

(FACULTY PARTICIPATION/SUCCESS BY DISCIPLINE) 1972-1975

Disciplinary Category	Year 72-73	73-74	74-74	75-76	TOTAL (All Yrs.)
Fine Arts	36/4	19/2	24/3	17/4	96/13
Social Science	95/9	57/8	85/17	49/4	286/38
Natural Science	163/16	98/12	90/13	67/11	408/52
Humanities	53/11	32/5	43/5	35/8	163/29
Professional	74/5	42/11	52/5	56/7	224/28
TOTAL: ALL Disciplines	421/45	238/38	294/43	223/43	1178/160

TABLE 3

FGIUI AWARDS BY ACADEMIC RANK (1972-1974)

	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	Total-3Yrs.
Professor	17 (29.8)	9 (15.5)	10 (12.5)	36 (21.3)
Associate Professor	9 (15.8)	21 (38.2)	17 (31.5)	47 (27.8)
Assistant Professor	27 (47.4)	24 (41.4)	21 (38.9)	72 (42.6)
Chairman	1 (1.8)	1 (1.7)	1 (1.9)	3 (1.8)
Instructor	3 (5.3)	1 (1.7)	1 (1.9)	5 (3.0)
Lecturer		2 (3.4)	2 (3.7)	4 (2.4)
Advisor			1 (1.9)	1 (0.6)
Technical Assistant			1 (1.9)	1 (0.6)
Total: All ranks	57	58	54	169
Includes Collaborators				

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF EIT NOMINATIONS (ELIGIBLE AND ACTUAL)

AND AWARDS BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE, 1972-1974

Institutional Types	Number Eligible Units	1972-73 Elig. Nom.	1972-73 Actual Nom.	1972-73 Awards	1973-74 Elig. Nom.	1973-74 Actual Nom.	1973-74 Awards	1974-75 Elig. Nom.	1974-75 Actual Nom.	1974-75 Awards	Total: 3 years Elig. Nom.	Total: 3 years Actual Nom.	Total: 3 years Awards
University Centers	4	16	16	18	36	33	28	36	28	22	88	77	68
4 Year	12-13-14	25	17	18	56	45	39	58	43	33	139	105	90
Special	4	4	2	4	8	4	2	8	4	1	20	10	7
Agriculture & Techonology	6	8	8	12	18	16	16	18	18	11	44	42	39
Statutory	4	4	2	2	8	4	2	8	4	3	20	10	7
Community	38	66	22	22	136	67	17	134	69	36	336	158	75
Total: All Types	68-69-70	123	67	76	262	169	104	262	166	106	647	402	286*

* Unsuccessful DTP nominees are sometimes shifted to EIT competition, making it possible for more awards to be made than nominations. Such shifts accounted for 27 EIT awards over a three-year period.

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF EIT AWARDS

BY DISCIPLINE, 1972-1974

Disciplinary Category	Year 1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	Total 3 Years
Fine Arts	6	7	6	19
Natural Sciences	25	35	34	94
Social Sciences	25	32	32	89
Humanities	12	20	25	57
Professional	8	10	9	27
Total: All Disciplines	76	104	106	286

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF DTP NOMINATIONS/AWARDS

BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE, 1972-1974

Institutional Type	Eligible Campuses	Year 72-73	73-74	74-75	Total 3 years
University Centers	4	4/2	4/3	2/1	10/6
4 year	10	8/6	7/5	6/5	21/16
Specialized	2	2/0	2/1	2/0	6/1
Ag. & Tech.	6	5/1	6/0	6/1	17/2
Total: All types		19/9	19/9	16/7	54/25

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF DTP NOMINATIONS/AWARDS

BY DISCIPLINE, 1972-1974

Disciplinary Category	Year 1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	Total 3 Years
Fine Arts	1/1	1/1	1/0	3/1
Natural Science	8/3	9/5	9/3	26/11
Social Sciences	4/2	7/2	2/2	13/6
Humanities	4/3	2/1	2/1	8/5
Professional	2/0	0/0	2/1	4/1
Total: All Disciplines	19/9	19/9	16/7	54/25

TABLE 8

CAMPUS PARTICIPATION*/SUCCESS** IN DTP PROGRAM

BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE, 1972-1974

Type of Campus	Eligible Units	Year 1972-73	Year 1973-74	Year 1974-74	Total: 3 Years
Univ. Ctrs.	4	4/2	4/3	2/1	4/4
4 Year	10	8/6	7/5	6/5	9/9
Specialized	2	2/0	2/1	2/0	2/1
Ag. & Tech.	6	5/1	6/0	6/1	6/2
Statutory	0	-	-	-	-
Community	0	-	-	-	-
Total: All Types	22	19/9	19/9	16/7	21/16

* Number of campuses submitting a DTP nomination.
** Number of campuses receiving a DTPship.

TABLE 9

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES TO ALL ITEMS - PHASE I AND

LIST OF SIGNIFICANT GROUP DIFFERENCES [1]

QUESTION	no knowledge	vague familiarity	considerable familiarity	detailed knowledge	LEVEL OF FAMILIARITY
1. How familiar are you with the SUNY teaching awards and grants to improve undergraduate instruction?	8.3%	54.6%	22.2%	6.9%	Instructors (less) Professors (more)

2. Where did you learn about the SUNY teaching awards and grants to improve undergraduate instruction?	Percentage	
a. Dept or individual communication	59.8	Nominees (more)
b. Campus research office	30.6	Nominees (more)
c. Campus President's office	16.8	Assistant Prof (less) Full Professor (more)
d. Campus newspaper	25.8	
e. SUNY Central Office	13.1	

3. How satisfied are you with the information made available about each of the following aspects of the grants and awards program?	1 very satisfied	2 somewhat satisfied	3 somewhat dissatisfied	4 very dissatisfied	SATISFACTION
a. Type of projects for which instructional improvement grants are given.	10.2	39.5	29.2	21.1	University Ctr. (less) Full Prof (more)
b. Application procedures for instructional improvement grants.	12.6	40.8	29.2	17.4	University Ctr. (less) Nominees (more)
c. Deadlines for receipt of grant proposals or award nominations.	19.7	38.3	24.6	17.4	University Ctr. (less)
d. Criteria and procedures for review of grant proposals.	7.6	34.5	32.3	25.7	Full Prof (more)
e. Nomination procedures for teaching awards.	9.3	30.9	27.1	32.7	
d. Criteria and procedures for selection of teaching award recipients.	9.4	25.6	27.6	36.4	

by my department/division has:	increased	remained about the same	decreased	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES
	26.6	59.9	13.5	

5. How much impact have the SUNY grant and award program had on the importance accorded teaching by your department/division?

1 A great deal	2 moderate amount	3 rather little	4 none at all	
1.5	12.3	37.6	48.6	IMPACT Four-year Colleges (more) Nominees (more)

6. How important would the availability of each of the following be in encouraging you to design and execute a project for improving undergraduate instruction?

	1 very important	2 somewhat important	3 somewhat unimportant	4 very unimportant	IMPORTANCE
a. Supplemental pay	35.3	37.0	17.0	10.7	
b. Released time	60.7	25.5	7.9	5.9	
c. Summer grants	53.6	29.4	9.6	7.2	
d. Office space	7.9	11.9	28.2	51.9	Four-year College (more) Inst. & Lecturer (more)
e. Technical assistance from instr. development specialists	26.7	40.7	18.5	14.1	University Center (less)

7. How effective is each approach listed below in encouraging and rewarding good teaching?

	1 very effective	2 somewhat effective	3 somewhat ineffective	4 very ineffective	EFFECTIVENESS
a. Campus workshops on improving instruction	10.5	41/4	26.0	22.1	U-Center (less)
b. Rewards for teaching excellence	26.7	39.1	16.6	15.6	U-Center (more)
c. Public recognition for good teaching	32.3	42.5	14.2	10.9	
d. Student evaluation of instruction	22.9	46.6	20.2	10.3	Instructor (more)
e. Centers for instructional improvement	11.6	34.9	32.7	20.8	U - Center (less) Nominees (more) Full Prof (less)
f. Professional association conferences on instructional improvement	16.4	42.6	24.9	16.1	U - Center (less)
g. Provision of outside consultants	10.1	36.5	29.0	24.4	U - Center (less Instructor (more)
h. Grants to develop					

8. Listed below are professional aspirations you might have for the coming academic year. How important is each to you?

	1 very important	2 somewhat important	3 somewhat unimportant	4 very unimportant	IMPORTANCE
a. Serve as a consultant to government or industry.	11.6	24.4	21.8	42.2	
b. Receive a teaching award or instructional grant.	32.2	38.2	18.4	10.7	Nominees (more)
c. Spend more time advising students.	25.0	42.0	21.6	11.4	U-Center (less) Instructor (more)
d. Obtain a research grant.	29.2	32.9	20.5	17.3	Instructor (less)
e. Be lected to College/ University Senate.	2.0	1 .4	33.1	62.5	
f. Become an institutional administrator (e.g. chairperson, dean)	4.1	12.1	17.0	66.8	Comm. Coll. (more)
g. Receive tenure or a promotion.	38.5	23.6	11.1	26.8	U - Center (more) Comm. Coll. (less) Instructor and Asst. Prof (more) Professor (less)
h. Write and/or publish.	48.0	31.7	11.1	9.1	Instructor (less)
i. Continue what I am now doing.	65.3	28.9	4.0	1.8	Nominees (more)

9. How important a role should each of the following play in developing ways to recognize and reward good teaching?

	1 very important	2 somewhat important	3 somewhat unimportant	4 very unimportant	Significant Differences
a. Academic Departments	79.0	15.3	3.1	2.6	
b. State Education Dept.	10.7	33.6	26.3	29.4	
c. Federal agencies (e.g. NSF, NIMH	9.2	27.9	31.4	31.4	
d. Individual campus administration	51.4	32.3	10.0	6.3	
e. Professional assoc.	25.3	41.1	20.0	13.6	
f. Professional unions	12.5	22.8	25.7	39.0	
g. SUNY Central Admin.	20.6	32.8	21.2	25.5	

10. Using the scale below, please indicate how important receiving a teaching award should be relative to publications in:

	1 Teaching Award More Important	2 Teaching Award Equally Impor.	3 Teaching Award Less important	
a. Promotion/Tenure decisions	37.3	46.2	16.5	U-Centers (less) Comm. Coll. (more)
b. Sabbatical Authorizations	22.1	51.7	26.3	Comm. Coll (more)

TABLE 10

Percentage Response To All Items - Phase II and

List of Significant Differences

1. Please indicate the number of times since 1972 you have been.	Total	1	2	3	4 or more
a. A recipient of an instructional grant	136	109	20	5	2
b. An applicant for an instructional grant	384	248	89	35	8
c. A recipient of an excellence in teaching award	167	162	4	1	-
d. A nominee for an excellence in teaching award	260	185	68	26	1
e. A recipient of a distinguished teaching professorship	19	19	-	-	-
f. A nominee for a distinguished teaching professorship	72	57	12	3	-

2. How much has each of the following changed as a result of your participation in the grant or award program? (N=599)	1 Increased a great deal	2 Increased a moderate amount	3 stayed about the same	4 decreased a moderate amount	5 decreased a great deal	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES
a. My status in my dept.	4.0	25.8	67.2	2.0	1.0	Comm. Coll. (increase) Center (decrease)
b. My effectiveness as a teacher	7.4	32.4	58.1	1.5	0.5	Recipients (increased)
c. My sense of professional satisfaction	28.0	36.2	26.7	7.2	1.8	Recipients (increased)
d. My general involvement in teaching improvement on campus	8.1	30.3	59.2	1.5	.8	
e. The extent to which I have been consulted by admin. and colleagues on the improvement of teaching.	4.8	20.5	72.0	1.9	.8	
f. Student satisfaction with my teaching	5.0	25.7	67.6	1.5	0.2	Comm. Coll. (increase)
g. The amount of faculty-student interaction in my course	6.9	20.9	70.6	1.4	0.2	Center (decrease)
h. My teaching style	5.9	26.7	66.7	0.5	0.2	

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE ANSWERED BY THOSE WHO HAVE APPLIED FOR OR RECEIVED A GRANT TO IMPROVE UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION.

7. How important were the following antecedent conditions in suggesting the need for your proposed project?

(N=377)

	1 very important	2 somewhat important	3 somewhat unimportant	4 very unimportant
a. Student dissatisfaction with a course or program	12.3	31.7	19.5	35.5
b. Peer or colleague dissatisfaction with a couse or program	7.2	19.5	27.2	46.1
c. A change in dept. emphasis	7.6	22.4	25.4	44.6
d. A change in colleague emphasis	4.1	19.3	25.6	51.0
e. A visceral feeling	35.1	34.0	10.7	20.0
f. Decreasing enrollments	2.5	7.4	21.5	68.7
g. A change in, or addition to, my field, discipline or profession	30.9	21.3	16.2	31.6
h. Hearing about success with the idea elsewhere	15.3	28.2	20.1	36.5
i. A change or improvement in instructional technology	38.5	29.7	11.7	20.2
j. A low rating by an accrediting body	0	1.1	12.1	86.8

IMPORTANCE

Recipients (more)

8. How important were the following circumstances in stimulating you to apply for a SUNY Faculty Grant for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction?

(N=395)

	1 very important	2 somewhat important	3 somewhat unimportant	4 very unimportant
a. Encouragement from dept. or college admin.	13.5	27.3	15.8	43.4
b. Encouragement from colleagues	11.0	26.2	23.8	39.0
c. Lack of available money from other funding sources	50.3	25.5	10.2	14.0
d. Lack of available money from regular dept. or college sources	63.4	20.2	6.6	9.8
e. Stimulation by the announcement of the SUNY Grants program	41.3	41.8	7.6	9.4
f. Hearing about a colleague's project having been funded	6.3	16.0	16.5	61.2

IMPORTANCE

The following is influencing your thinking about the development of your project?	very important	somewhat important	somewhat unimportant	very unimportant	Importance
(N=484)					
a. Discussions with colleagues in your discipline (at your institution or elsewhere.	33.9	38.6	11.3	16.2	
b. Discussions with individuals in fields which support instructional improvement (e.g. media specialists, education specialists, etc.)	22.4	29.6	16.0	32.0	Comm. Coll. (more) Center (less)
c. Discussions with students	26.1	41.0	16.8	14.2	
d. A paper heard at a professional meeting.	16.7	41.0	16.8	14.2	
e. Article in a discipline-related journal.	11.0	27.2	18.8	43.1	
f. Articles in educational or psychological journal.	9.6	21.1	16.7	52.6	
g. Books and/or monographs	8.9	26.8	17.8	46.5	

16. Please indicate your agreement with inclusion of the following criteria for selection of grants for improving undergraduate instruction.	1 strongly agree	2 agree	3 disagree	4 strongly disagree	Agreement
(N=417)					
a. Well explained goals and rationale	77.0	21.8	1.0	0.2	
b. Clearly stated and attainable objectives	74.1	21.8	3.6	0.5	
c. Documentation of adequacy and capability of staff for project implementation	49.1	44.0	5.8	1.0	
d. Reasonableness of project budget	47.9	48.9	2.4	0.7	
e. Innovative in substance	37.5	47.7	11.4	3.4	
f. Innovative in methodology	31.4	43.5	20.5	4.6	
g. Equality of distribution of grants among institutional types and disciplines	27.3	24.1	29.2	19.5	Center (less)
h. Some degree of campus support	16.2	16.4	25.1	12.3	
i. Repeatability of project	23.8	45.7	23.3	7.1	
j. Positive results in terms of student-learneroutcomes	41.7	43.7	11.1	3.5	Comm. Coll. (more)
k. Potential number of students to be benefited.	18.4	45.5	29.3	6.8	Comm. Coll. (more)
l. Feasibility in terms of time-frame type of campus and students involved	33.6	59.4	5.1	1.9	

The following questions were answered by those who have received a faculty grant for the improvement of undergraduate instruction.

12. Which of the following descriptions best characterizes the present state of the results of your project?

	Responses	Percentage	(N=136)
a. It is being continued in original form.	42	.30	
b. It was reduced in scope but is being continued	33	.24	
c. It is being continued in expanded form	47	.34	
d. It was cancelled	15	.11	

13. To your knowledge, is the program or course your developed being used by other instructors? Check those categories for which your answer is yes.

	Responses	Percentage	(N=136)
a. In your department	61	.44	
b. IN other departments	35	.25	
c. In other colleges or universities	35	.25	

14. Please rate the extent to which your project has contributed to either instructional effectiveness or efficiency in the following areas. Use the scale provided.

	1 to a great extent	2 considerable	3 little	4 not at all
(N=136)				
a. More students learn the material	33.6	42.0	16.8	7.6
b. Students retain what they learn longer.	33.6	40.9	17.3	8.2
c. Students learn the same with less resources investment	19.3	21.1	20.2	39.4
d. Students learn the same by working less	10.9	14.5	18.2	56.4
e. Students enjoy the experience more	48.7	37.0	11.8	2.5
f. Students learn something different	37.5	30.0	20.0	12.5

15. On what type of campus do you teach? (N=668)

University Center	22.5	Four-year College	34.3
Statutory College	3.0	Community College	23.7
Agricultural and Technical College	12.1	Specialized College	4.4

16. What is your present faculty rank?

Instructor	1.1	Assistant Professor	28.9
Lecturer	.8	Associate Professor	36.2
Full Professor	30.3	Distinguished Professor	2.7

17. In which department or division do you teach?

18. What is your age? Mean = 41.25 years

19. What is your highest academic degree?

Academic Masters	Professional Doctorate	Academic Doctorate
26.3%	10%	56.4%

20. How many years have you been a full-time faculty member at your present instution?

	Average	
	9.02	years
SUNY?	9.22	years
in postsecondary education?	11.84	years

21. Are you presently tenured?

Yes	No
75.8%	24.1%

22. What proportion of your work was devoted to the following activities during the past academic year (1974-1975)? Please use percentages that can sum to 100%.

	Average
a. Teaching	61.9%
b. Advisement	9.2%
c. Research	12.6%
d. Governance	5.7%
e. Professional Service	4.9%
f. Other	5.7%

	PERCENTAGE (N=488)
a. Increasing the number of awards	57%
b. Increasing the dollar amount of awards	30%
c. Increasing the amount of money per project	28%
d. Increasing the amount of the cash award	19%
e. Relating the grants to campus curriculum planning	45%
f. Relating the awards to campus curriculum planning	28%

4. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following:

	1 Strongly agree	2 agree	3 disagree	4 strongly disagree	AGREEMENT
a. The distinguished Teaching Professorship award should be eliminated	11.5	6.1	33.5	48.8	Center (less) Comm. Coll. (more)
b. The Excellence in Teaching award should be eliminated	10.7	6.7	28.9	53.7	Center (less) Comm. Coll. (more)
c. The Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction should be eliminated	1.4	3.2	21.7	74.8	Other (less)

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE ANSWERED BY THOSE WHO WERE NOMINATED FOR OR RECEIVED A TEACHING AWARD

5. Please indicate your agreement with inclusion of the following criteria for selecting of teaching awards:

	1 Strongly agree	2 agree	3 disagree	4 strongly disagree	(N=409)	AGREEMENT
a. Mastery of several teaching techniques	37.9	48.1	15.5	6.4		
b. Flexible instructional policy which adapts readily to student needs, interests, and problems	56.5	37.3	4.2	2.0		
c. Generosity with personal time and accessibility	62.8	33.2	3.6	1.2		
d. Continual concern with the intellectual and social growth of individual students	67.5	29.1	2.4	1.0		
e. High standards for student achievement and academic excellence of students	64.5	32.0	2.2	1.2		
f. Evidence of student evaluation that discriminates among final levels of competence	40.8	44.5	10.5	4.3		
g. Recommendation for an award can only go to a faculty member who has regularly carried a normal teaching load for his/her campus	51.1	26.8	12.5	9.6		Center (less) 4-year (more)
h. General scholarship, demonstrate through publications or artistic production	17.6	31.4	39.1	11.7		

APPENDIX C

Statistically Significant Group Differences

(Secondary Analysis of Questionnaire Data)

Statistically Significant Group Difference

The right-hand column of Tables 9 and 10 list the items for which statistically significant differences among the cross-comparison group occurred.

Comparisons across different institutional types showed that University Centers faculty in comparison with faculty from other type institutions:

1. were less satisfied than other types with information made available about types of projects for which instructional grants are given, application procedures for instructional improvement grants, and deadlines for receipt of grant proposals or award nominations.

2. considered technical assistance from instructional development specialists to be less important in encouraging them to design an instructional improvement project.

3. considered campus workshops on improving instruction, rewards for teaching excellence, centers for instructional improvement, professional association conferences on instructional improvement, and outside consultants to be less effective approaches to encourage and reward good teaching.

4. considered spending more time advising students to be a less important aspiration for the coming year.

5. considered receiving a promotion or tenure as a more important aspiration.

6. considered winning a teaching award to be less important than publications in contributing to promotion and tenure.

7. believed that campus administrators should have less influence in selecting recipients of teaching awards.

8. considered receiving an instructional grant to be less important than receiving a research grant for both promotion/tenure and for sabbatical authorization.

9. agreed more strongly that the money spent for teaching award is well spent.

10. disagreed that campuses whose mission is primarily teaching should receive a larger share of awards.

Four year college faculty in comparison with faculties from other types of institutions felt:

1. that the SUNY grant and award program had more impact on the importance accorded teaching by one's departments/division.

2. felt that the availability of office space was more important in encouraging them to design and execute a project for improving undergraduate instructions.

3. felt that campus administrators should have more influence in selecting recipients of teaching awards.

Faculty from community colleges in comparison with other type institutions:

1. considered in becoming an institutional administrator such as a chairperson or Dean as a more important aspiration for the coming year.

2. considered receiving a teaching award to be more important than publications or both promotion and tenure decisions and sabbatical authorizations.

3. felt that SUNY central staff should have less influence in selecting recipients of teaching awards.

4. felt that receiving an instructional grant should be more important than receiving a research grant in both promotion and tenure decisions and in sabbatical authorizations.

Comparison across different instructional ranks yielded the following significant differences:

1. full and associate professors considered themselves more familiar with the student teaching awards and grants to improve undergraduate instruction.

2. tended to learn about the teaching awards and grants more from the campus President's office.

3. were more satisfied with information made available about the types of projects for which instructional improvement grants are given.

4. were more satisfied with the information made available about the criteria and procedures for review of grant proposal.

5. believed that centers for instructional improvement were less effective approaches to encouraging and rewarding good teaching.

6. considered receiving a promotion or a tenure as a less important aspiration for the coming year.

7. agreed less that money now spent to recognize good teachers would be better spent to help the weaker teachers improve.

Instructors and assistant professors in comparison with other professorial ranks:

1. were less familiar with the SUNY teaching awards and grants.

2. tended less to learn about teaching awards from the campus President's office.

3. felt that office space was more important in encouraging them to design and execute a project for improving undergraduate instruction.

4. felt that student evaluations of instructions were more effective approaches for encouraging and rewarding good teachers.

5. felt that provision of outside consultants were more effective approaches to encouraging and rewarding good teaching.

6. considered in obtaining a research grant a less important aspiration for the coming year.

7. considered spending more time advising students to be a more important professional aspiration for the coming year.

8. considered receiving a tenure or a promotion to be a more important aspiration for the coming year.

9. considered writing and/or publishing to be a less important aspiration for the coming year.

Grant nominees as opposed to those who have not received nominations felt:

1. that they tended to learn about the SUNY teaching awards and grants to improve undergraduate instruction more from the departmental individual communication and more from campus research offices.

2. were more satisfied with information made available about application procedures for instructional improvement grants.

3. felt that the SUNY grant award program had more impact on the importance accorded teaching by their department or division.

4. believed that centers for instructional improvement were more effective approaches to encouraging and rewarding good teaching.

5. considered receiving a teaching award or instructional grant to be a more important aspiration for them for the coming year.

6. considered continuing what they were now doing to be a more important aspiration for the coming year.

Comparisons were made between institutional types and between recipients and nominees on their reactions to the questions from Questionnaire #2 and the Phase II Questionnaire which dealt with the processes of participation. The following comparisons showed statistically significant differences across the groups being compared.

Participants from the University Centers:

1. felt that their status in their department had decreased as a result of participation in the grant or award program.

2. felt that the amount of faculty student interaction in their course had decreased as a result of participation in the grant or award program.

3. disagreed that the Distinguished Teaching Professorship award and the Excellence in teaching awards should be eliminated.

4. agreed less that a recommendation for an award should go only to faculty members who have regularly carried a normal teaching load.

5. felt that discussions with individuals in fields which support instructional improvement were less important in influencing their thinking about the development of their project.

6. agreed less that equality of distribution of grants among institutional types and disciplines should be a criterion for selection of grants for improving undergraduate instruction.

Community college participants:

1. felt that their status in the department had increased as a result of participation in the grant or award program.

2. felt that student satisfaction with their teaching had increased as a result of participation in a grant or award program.

3. tended to agree more that the Distinguished Teaching Professorship award and the Excellence in teaching award should be eliminated.

4. felt that discussion with individuals in fields which support instructional improvement were more important in influencing their thinking about the development of their project.

5. believed more strongly that positive results in terms of student learner outcomes should be a criterion for selection of grants for improving undergraduate instruction.

6. believed more strongly that the potential number of students to be benefited should be a criterion for selection of grants for improving undergraduate instruction.

Recipients of awards differed significantly from those who participated but did not receive awards in the following ways. The recipients:

1. felt that their effectiveness as a teacher had increased.

2. felt that their sense of professional satisfaction had increased as a result of participation in the awards program.

3. felt that a visceral feeling was a more important condition in suggesting the need for a project.

APPENDIX D

Questionnaire To Potential

Year II Program Participants

APPENDIX D

Results of Questionnaire sent to Potential

Year II Participants, Spring 1976

---

1. 90% a) I would be interested in participating in regional meetings among persons who have received teaching awards and instructional development grants or a distinguished teaching professorship.

   9% b) I would not

   (If b) is checked you need not answer any additional questions.)

2. I would prefer:

   5% a) more frequent and shorter meetings, e.g. once a month for two hours.

   89% b) less frequent longer meetings, e.g., one full day every three months.

3. I would prefer:

   50% meetings organized around lunch.

   11.6% meetings organized around dinner.

   14.9% afternoon meetings (no meal).

   2% evening meetings (no meal).

4. Aside from a review of the teaching award and faculty grants programs, I favor the following topics for the meetings (check as many as seem relevant):

   55% New approaches to general or liberal education.

   63% Ways of improving academic quality in SUNY.

   51% Inter-campus academic cooperation.

   42% Individualization of instruction.

   30% Academic programs for new clientele.

   69% The evaluation of teaching.

   Other topics I would suggest are:

5. The meetings:

16% Need not have a definite outcome; the conversations themselves will be stimulating enough.

27% Should be summarized or recorded (not verbatim) in some general way for sharing with participants in other regions.

30% Should produce definite recommendations to be forwarded to the Chancellor, Council of Presidents and Faculty Senate.

26% No answer.

6. The format and subject of the meetings:

36% Should be as similar as possible in each of the regions (in order to create a University-wide impact).

30% Should be developed separately and appropriately in each of the regions.

21% Should be open-ended; the less agenda and structure the better.

13% No answer.

7. Participants

44% Should be representatives of all disciplines and fields.

4% Should meet only by fields or disciplines.

40% Should meet part of the time by fields or disciplines.

12% No answer.

APPENDIX E

Post-Meeting Feedback From Participants

To assess further the usefulness of the Regional meetings, a short questionnaire was mailed during July of 1977 to 350 recipients of awards and grants who had been invited to attend these meetings. Forty-eight Percent (168) of the questionnaires were returned with 64.1% of the respondents indicating attendance at at least one meeting and 29.3% attending 2 or more. Results appear in Appendix F.

The questionnaire assessed reasons for non-attendance, perceptions of usefulness and effectiveness of meetings, perceptions of goals and accomplishments of the meetings, and suggestions for future activities of the groups.

The most common reason for non-attendance at any or all of the meetings was due to conflicts with their teaching schedule (54.3%) and for conflicts with other meetings (30.5%) relating to their teaching. Only 1.8% of the respondents indicated that they had no knowledge of the meetings and only 7.3% said they lacked any interest in such activities. This finding supports the attitude that had been commonly expressed during the meetings that many awardees did not attend precisely because they wished to devote time to teaching.

In response to the questions concerning the value of getting the award winners and grant recipients together, 92.8% indicated that it was valuable. In respect to the meetings themselves 75.2% responded that the meetings were useful. Those that said the meetings were not overly useful commented that there appeared to be a lack of agenda and direction at some of the meetings or that the concerns and approaches to the issues differed too much between those who had received awards and those who had received grants.

Respondents indicated generally that the usefulness of the meetings derived chiefly from the exchange of ideas and resources among awardees and guest speakers.

Very few indicated that any change resulted on their campus as an outgrowth of these meetings. The most common response concerning change concerned effects of winning on one's own view of teaching. A view collaborrating the survey of a year earlier. Only one respondent indicated that a small task force to discuss ways to improve teaching was begun on campus.

Differences between what recipients thought should have happened and what they perceived as having actually happened (Question 8) suggest that the meetings may have been too narrowly focussed. The smaller differences between expectation and perceptions occurred with regard to such topics as:

		DIFFERENCE
(a)	The review of the awards program	6.5%
(g)	The evaluation of teaching	14.9%
(e)	Individualization of instruction	32.6%

The larger differences occurred with regard to the broader academic and institutional issues:

(d)	inter-campus academic cooperation	43.2%
(f)	academic program for new clientele	44.9%
(c)	ways of improving academic quality	55.7%
(b)	new approaches to general and liberal education	60.7%

It appears that award recipients were less inclined upon attending the meetings to limit discussion to the award program; that in many cases they did so because of direction from group leaders; but were not generally satisfied with the approach.

APPENDIX E, Cont.

Responses of Participants to Questions Evaluating Year II Meetings

1. If you did not attend any or all of the meetings, please indicate why? (check as many as appropriate)

	N	%
a. conflict with other meetings	50	30.5
b. conflict with teaching schedule	89	54.3
c. lack of interest	12	7.3
d. distance to the meetings	17	10.4
e. no knowledge of the meetings	3	1.8
f. insufficient advance notice	14	8.5
g. not permitted to go by administration	0	0
h. other	16	9.8

2. How valuable do you feel that it is for the SUNY Award winners to get together to discuss ways to elevate the importance of teaching?

	N	Relative %	Adjusted %
1. very valuable	37	22.6	33.3
2. some value	66	40.2	59.5
3. relative little value	6	3.7	5.4
4. not valuable	2	1.2	1.8
no response	53	32.3	

3. Were the meetings you attended useful?

1. very useful	18	11.0	17.8
2. somewhat useful	58	35.4	57.4
3. relative little use	16	9.8	15.8
4. not useful	8	5.5	8.9
no response	63	38.4	

		N	%
4.	The meetings were useful because of:		
	a. special interest group topics	21	12.8
	b. exchange of resources and information among awardees	65	39.6
	c. exchange of ideas and information from campus experts or speakers	50	30.5
	d. outside speakers	12	7.3
	e. other	5	3.0
5.	Have many changes taken place on your campus as a result of these meetings?		
	1. Yes	17	17.3
	2. No	81	82.7
	out range N=66		

6. The topics indicated below are those on the planning survey from which the past year's meetings were organized. a) to what extent do you feel these topics <u>should</u> have been dealt with? b) to what extent in your view <u>did</u> the meetings address these topics? Figures below combined % responses to "a great deal" and "a moderate amount" categories.

	A should	B did	A-B difference
a. review of teaching awards & faculty grants	70.8	64.3	6.5
b. new approaches to general or liberal education	83.3	22.6	60.7
c. ways of improving academic quality in SUNY	91.4	35.7	55.7
d. inter-campus academic cooperation	62.9	19.7	43.2
e. individualization of instruction	56.3	23.7	32.6
f. academic programs for new clienteles	48.8	3.9	44.9
g. the evaluation of teaching	81.1	66.2	14.9

		N	%
7.	To what extent do you feel that attempts to bring awardees and grant winners together is worth repeating?		
	a. a great deal	27	26.2
	b. moderate amount	45	43.7
	c. somewhat	23	22.8
	d. not at all	8	7.8
	no response 61		

	N	%
8. What types of activities would you prefer to continue in order to elevate the importance of teaching in SUNY?		
a. regional conferences with all disciplines & fields	44	26.8
b. regional conferences by disciplines or fields	64	39.0
c. statewide conferences with all disciplines & fields	19	11.6
d. statewide conferences by disciplines or fields	48	29.3
e. special interest conferences	49	29.9
f. a newsletter exchange among award winners & grant recipients	24	14.6
g. other	4	2.4

	N	Adjusted	Relative
9. To what extent would you participate in these activities?			
a. virtual certainty	29	26.1	
b. likely	72	64.9	
c. somewhat unlikely	9	8.1	
d. would not participate	1	.9	
10. Any additional comments about the meetings or the past year's events?	N	Adjusted	Relative
a. Yes	42	37.8	25.6
b. No	69	62.2	42.1
blank	53		32.3